



STATE OF WASHINGTON

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR STANDARDS BOARD

Old Capitol Building, PO Box 47236 · Olympia, WA 98504-3113 · (360) 725-6275 · www.pesb.wa.gov

Minutes

September 25-26, 2001

Senate Hearing Room 3

Olympia, Washington

September 25, 2001

Members Present:	Tom Charouhas, Chair	Elaine Aoki
	Terry Bergeson	Carolyn Bradley
	Carol Coar	Nancy Diaz-Miller
	Ken Evans	Sheila Fox
	Gary Livingston	Helen Nelson-Throssell
	Martha Rice	Ron Scutt
	Karen Simpson	Pat Wasley
	Dennis Sterner	Tim Knue
	Yvonne Ullas	

Members Absent: Kay Nelson

Staff Present:	Jennifer Wallace	Pamela Abbott
	David Anderson	

Chair Charouhas called the meeting to order at 9:00 and reviewed the two-day agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes were approved unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Tom announced Emmitt Jackson had resigned from the Board and is focusing on his new job with Bechtel.

BASIC SKILLS TEST – Technical Advisory Group

David Anderson reviewed the process the Board used to make a selection of a basic skills test vendor. The technical advisory group issued two findings: both vendors are qualified to develop and implement a valid and reliable basic skills test for the state of Washington and they did not reach consensus on which vendor to recommend to the full Board.

Duncan MaQuarry and Gordon Ensign presented the following rating chart to the Board.

	ETS	NES
Responsiveness	5	9
Cost	5	9
Technical	9	8
Experience	9	7
Administration	10	6

Dr. Ensign feels NES is favored based on the proposal they submitted. In their proposal all parts of the RFP were addressed. NES addressed the basic skills test as an admissions test as well as a licensure test. NES also offered to prepare faculty guides, study guides, and a variety of orientation preparation documents. These items were included at no extra cost as opposed to ETS adding additional costs.

- NES showed flexibility. NES has had a long working in states with this type of project. NES has had all of their contracts renewed and sometimes many times over.
- NES proposed to do everything at a lower cost to all.

Dr. McQuarry feels there is no clear leader. There are subtle differences in each proposal. ETS has a long history; they also have done the job analysis across the country. Included in this survey were a number of teachers from Washington. The job analysis they have already done, would shorten the process. ETS has established test sites.

Dr. Anderson passed out a statement from Kathy Kimball. Dr. Anderson mentioned Dr. Kimball's statement favored ETS for their stronger track record as well as their resource availability.

Chair Charouhas then asked the other members of the Technical Advisory Group to share their views on the proposals.

Dr. Sterner felt:

- Both companies presented fair and excellent responses;
- NES was more flexible in their responses;
- ETS has an edge on technical merit;
- ETS has the edge on test sites;
- NES made a lot of promises that he is not sure they can deliver; and
- ETS has higher costs, but feels NES costs for the technical advisory group are unreasonably low.

Dr. Sterner would like for us to be able to look at an existing test. Dr. Anderson and Ms. Wallace explained the Attorney General's office has informed them they would have to reissue the RFP.

Dr. Livingston felt NES has a slight advantage for responding fully.

Chair Charouhas felt:

- Both proposals are great
- ETS failed to address scholarship opportunities and the Technical Advisory Group
- NES failed to address data dissemination.
- NES has offered a total product that is aligned with the RFP.

Dr. McQuarry and Dr. Ensign addressed questions from the Board regarding legal defensibility, validity, cost, accessibility, and purpose.

Legal defensibility is rooted in the test development process. The task analysis and the content we are testing on are relevant to the admissibility to a professional program. Basic skills tests have a solid foundation in the courts.

- Both companies provided schedules of reduced fees based on a student's income. The Board will set the fee schedule. The fees will depend on the services we receive.
- Both companies promised results would be returned within the request of 4 weeks.
- Board members expressed their concern in the cost, the number of administrations, and the number of testing sites and locations as potential accessibility issues.
- NES proposed the test could act as an admissions test and as a licensure test. ETS does not feel it would be appropriate to do so.
- NES will provide 200 tuition waivers and Title II reporting at no additional cost.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The November meeting date was changed from November 28-29 to November 27-28.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Board heard public comment from Randy Dorn of ETS and Les McCallum from NES.

Mr. Dorn is the ETS liaison in Washington State. ETS is very responsive and knowledgeable about testing. ETS has shown they can provide quality work. Mr. Dorn asked the Board to consider whether the product can be delivered on the timeline they currently have in place. Mr. Dorn thanked the Board in advance for choosing ETS as the basic skills test vendor.

Mr. McCallum is the NES consultant in Washington. NES is flexible. The costs are aligned with some of the states offering the same type of test. NES has demonstrated primary expertise is in teacher testing. The WEST is your customized program. The test is a valid, technically sound instrument and is a legally defensible test. NES would like to emphasize education participation.

The Board then participated in a discussion regarding each vendor. Chair Charouhas asked each member to speak about the vendor they would most likely choose. After each member had a chance to speak, Chair Charouhas called for the vote on a basic skills test vendor.

VOTE: NES was awarded the contract for the Basic Skills test. The vote was 9 for NES and 6 for ETS.

Chair Charouhas thanked both vendors for responding to the RFP.

PRACTICAL STDS. FOR FOSTERING HIGH QUALITY AND FAIR TEACHING TESTS

Dr. Stephen Klein gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Board on the four basic criteria for evaluating a test: Validity, reliability, fairness and resource requirements.

Validity

- Test measures what it is supposed to measure and not something else.
- Confidence that the scores provide appropriate information for the decisions that are based on them and the consequences of those decisions.
- Validity is not a characteristic of the test
- Scores may be valid for one type of decision but not another.
- Do not have to show that test scores predict success on the job.

Reliability

- Reported on a 0.00 to 1.00 scale
- Indicated by the consistency in candidate performance across questions.
- Grader consistency may be a factor too.
- On most test, focus is on consistency of examine scores across test forms.
- On licensing tests, focus is on consistency in pass/fail decisions across test forms.
- Interaction of reliability and passing rate.

Fairness

- Inform candidates about test specifications
- Standardize procedures (e.g. time limits)
- Equate scores across test forms
- Maintain test security
- Provide method for challenging scores
- Take steps to prevent and check for possible gender and racial/ethical bias.

Resource Requirements

- Test development
- Printing and distribution
- Test administration
- Scoring and analysis
- Score reporting
- Candidate testing time

Overview

- Test specification and passing scores affect preparation
- Test difficulty depends on the difficulty of the questions asked and the passing score.
- Longer tests yield more reliable scores.
- Multiple-choice items yield more reliable scores than essay questions per hour,
- Reduce the gap among racial/ethnic groups:
 - Making the scores less reliable
 - Lowering the passing score

There is no easy solution to this issue. Research shows that as the NCAA changed the rules for students to get scholarships, the schools changed their behavior, as did the students. Setting a cut score should be dynamic rather than static. Consider this now rather than later.

Dr. Bergeson asked if we could set a low cut score and ratchet up. Dr. Klein agreed this is a good idea.

Setting Passing Scores – what to measure and how.

- Time allowed to measure.
- Need some time limits.
- Separately timed sections or not
- Types of passing rules
- Compensatory
- Conjunctive
- Hybrid
- Banking

Factors to consider in setting passing scores

- All methods are based on panelists' judgments.
- Focus on minimum competency needed for practice
- Sensitive to market and political pressures; and the abilities of the labor pool

Conclusions

- Many more decisions ahead for the Board.
- Decisions will affect the percentage of people passing, who passes, and the skills teachers bring to their jobs and thereby can impart to their students.

- What you measure and your standards for passing will affect what examinees study, how hard they study and what they learn.
- Prepare now for the legal challenges that may lie ahead.
- There is a role for a small external technical advisory panel.

If the Board allows people to retake the test, Dr. Klein encouraged the Board to make people retake the entire test.

PRESENTATION ON TEACHING DATA

Pat Wasley gave a short PowerPoint presentation on the teaching profession for the Board.

The Board adjourned until 8:30am.

September 26, 2001

Members Present:	Tom Charouhas, Chair	Elaine Aoki
	Carolyn Bradley	Carol Coar
	Nancy Diaz-Miller	Ken Evans
	Sheila Fox	Tim Knue
	Gary Livingston	Helen Nelson-Throssell
	Martha Rice	Ron Scutt
	Karen Simpson	Dennis Sterner
	Yvonne Ullas	

Members Absent:	Kay Nelson	Terry Bergeson
	Pat Wasley	

Staff Present:	Jennifer Wallace	Pamela Abbott
	David Anderson	

Chair Charouhas called the Board to order at 8:30am.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Tim Knue was honored for the teacher of the year for vocational teacher educators.

PRINCIPAL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

The Board broke into two separate groups to discuss the Principal Subcommittee findings. The Board then spent about 45 minutes in their respective groups discussing the issues around principal certification in the State.

The Board reconvened for a discussion on the Principal subcommittee findings. The Board members discussed instructional leadership and facilitation leadership. Some members feel in order to be an effective Principal you need teaching experience, while others believe you can split the role into an instructional leader position and a facilitating

leadership position. The Board tabled the discussion until the November 27-28th meeting in Vancouver.

UPDATE FROM OSPI PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

Lin Douglas talked to the Board about Endorsement Competencies, the Teacher Evaluation Project and the Washington Initiative for National Board Certified Teachers.

Beginning September 1, 2003, the endorsement competencies will be in place. OPSI will start to look at the competencies to see where there are overlaps to give districts greater latitude to allow teaching in other similar subjects. In doing so, this will:

- Complement a performance-based system;
- Achieve learner outcomes across preparation programs; and
- Can help inform the content assessment process.

The Teacher Evaluation Project funded by the Stuart Foundation involves six school districts: Vancouver, Kennewick, Pasco, Central Kitsap, Ellensburg, and Shoreline. The project has received support from local associations and has plans to add an urban district in the near future.

Jeannie Harmon from OSPI joined Dr. Douglas to present on the National Board effort in Washington State. OSPI will be going to the Legislature one more time to work on the compensation piece. National Board Staff have told OSPI that in states with a really robust process, the following things need to happen:

1. Someone needs to help pay
2. Incentive at the end

There is a support system in place and currently WEA has been operating this voluntary support system. WEA is still involved with about 60 candidates. The hope is that in 2004 the State will help contribute.

The State now has a \$3500 award to National Board Certified Teachers. OSPI would like to see some sort of payoff that doesn't change from year to year. Ms. Harmon asked the PESB for support regarding the National Board Certification legislation.

MEMBER REPORTS

Board members discussed various workshops and training seminars they attended over the summer. Nancy Diaz-Miller and Helen Nelson-Throssell attended the mentor training academies put on by OSPI this summer. Ken Evans, Yvonne Ullas and Helen Nelson-Throssell attended the Teacher Evaluation workshops.

EDUCATIONAL STAFF ASSOCIATE SUB COMMITTEE REPORT

Carol Coar, Karen Rademaker-Simpson, Sheila Fox, and Kay Nelson are participating in a subcommittee regarding Educational Staff Associates. Carol Coar and Karen Rademaker Simpson and led the Board in a discussion about whether or not ESAs who receive national certification through their professional group should receive some sort of recognition.

Carol Coar stated she now believes ESA certification is not equal to National Board Certification for Teachers. Both Ms. Coar and Ms. Rademaker-Simpson believe there should be some sort of recognition, but are not sure of how to assign it.

DISTRICT CERTIFICATE

Ken Evans informed the Board that he along with Ron Scutt, Yvonne Ullas and Carolyn Bradley are working on a district certificate proposal to bring before the Board.

Ron would like to see the District Certificate come up a year from now. This will give the Board a chance to evaluate how the Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification program has worked.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

- The Request For Proposals for the Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification Partnership Grant Program has been issued to the school districts.
- The PESB and OSPI will be holding a planning meeting on October 17th for Districts, ESDs and Washington State teacher prep programs to work on their Alternative Route Partnership Grant Programs.
- We have not heard back from the Department of Education regarding the Transition to Teaching grant we applied for with OSPI.
- Ms. Wallace reviewed the budget with the Board.

The Board discussed the role of the Executive Committee.

Ms. Wallace outlined the Annual Report for 2001. The Board has an opportunity for a different type of report. The Board decided to make the report an evolving document. The Annual Report will include information on Alternative Routes, the subcommittees, assessment, and specific recommendations regarding the content test and the principal subcommittee.

Ms. Wallace will have the draft annual report at the November meeting for the Board to work on.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p. m.